

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claim 31-34 remain pending.

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to correct the typographical error kindly noted by the Examiner on page 8, line 1 of the specification.

35 U.S.C. §112 and Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claims 31-34 to overcome the claim objections noted by the Examiner. Further, Applicants have amended claim 31 to delete the last paragraph of the claim in view of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection in view of the foregoing amendments and for the following reasons.

Applicants note that, as shown in Fig. 4, a memory 3 is provided for storing a second program, such as a write control program for the EEP-ROM 4. The second program is included in a standard program region. The CPU is capable of executing a write operation to the EEP-ROM 4 based on executing the second program for data Dx and for a first program which is a user

program. See page 7, line 31 to page 8, line 5 and page 9, lines 29-34 of the specification (Fig. 5). That is, the write operation of the user program may be effected by a construction wherein the CPU 1 receives a program from outside through the I/O unit 5 in accordance with the second program stored in memory 3. Thus, the specification adequately describes a write operation that includes writing of data Dx and writing of the first program to the EEP-ROM 4.

Specifically, the specification states that the write operation of the user program may be effected by a construction wherein the CPU 1 receives a program from outside through the I/O unit 5 in accordance with the program of mask-ROM 3, and then makes the write operation to the user program region M1 of EEP-ROM 4. See page 9, third paragraph (lines 29-34 of the specification), as opposed to the second full paragraph cited in the Office Action in support of the rejection. Applicants note that the CPU is disclosed as being stopped in the embodiment discussed in the second full paragraph on page 9 of the specification, and therefore the Examiner's attention is directed to the third paragraph of the specification which explains that the CPU is capable of executing the write operation for the EEP-ROM without a stop of the operation.

Applicants request reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection for the foregoing reasons.

Request for Interview

Applicants contacted the Examiner to request an Interview, however it was decided that it would be preferable at this stage of the prosecution for Applicants to submit a written reply for the Examiner's consideration. Further, the Examiner agreed to contact the undersigned to discuss the application in the event that the present reply does not place the application in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John R. Mattingly", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: January 10, 2005